



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,656	12/28/2000	Fabrice Della Mea	Q62485	8724
23373 7590 05/12/2008				
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC				
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800				
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
RAMPURIA, SHARAD K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/12/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
4

5
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
7 AND INTERFERENCES
8

9
10 Ex parte FABRICE DELLA MEA
11

12
13 Appeal 2007-2856
14 Application 09/749,656
15 Technology Center 2600
16

17
18 Oral Hearing Held: February 13, 2008
19
20

21
22 Before JOSEPH F. RUGGIERO, ROBERT E. NAPPI, and KEVIN F.
23 TURNER, Administrative Patent Judges
24

25 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:
26

27 RUTHLEEN UI, ATTORNEY
28 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
29 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
30 SUITE 800
31 WASHINGTON DC 20037
32

33 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday,
34 February 13, 2008, commencing at 1:00 p.m., at The U.S. Patent and
35 Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Virginia
36 Johnson, Notary Public.
37

MS. HALL: Good afternoon. This is Calendar Number 14, Appeal Number 2007-2856. Attorney's name is Ruthleen Ui.

MS. UI: Good afternoon.

JUDGE RUGGIERO: Hello.

MS. UI: My name is Ruthleen Ui and I represent the Appellant with respect to Appeal Number 2007-2856.

JUDGE RUGGIERO: Could you spell your name for the reporter?

MS. UI: Ruthleen Ui, R U T H L E E N. Ui, U I.

JUDGE RUGGIERO: Great.

MS. UI: Claims 1 through 22 are pending in the present application. Claims 20 and 21 have been allowed. Claims 2 and 8 and 15 and 18 have been objected, but would be allowed if rewritten independent form. I will be specifically discussing the rejection of Independent Claim 1 as discussed in the Appellant's Appeal Brief.

Claim 1 was rejected as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Oestreich. The Examiner cites Oestreich for teaching selecting a common coding mode for each mobile station and the selection of a common coding mode takes account the traffic load in at least cell. It is the Appellant's position that Oestreich does not teach this aspect of the claim.

The Examiner asserts that Oestreich teaches that the traffic load causes transcoding to change, but it is Appellant's position that in Oestreich during a tandem free operation mode, the speech information is transmitted only via broadband transmission. And, Oestreich merely discloses that a control, control means detects interruptions in the transmission and therefore if change-over is necessary, it changes to a narrowband speech coding method.

1 Oestreich discloses that for a given connection to monitor the
2 transmission possibilities and depending on this monitoring to execute, if
3 necessary, a switch-over from broadband to a narrowband speech coding
4 method so that it is switching over from a tandem free operation mode to a
5 non-tandem free operation mode depending on whether it's in the broadband
6 or narrowband transmission.

7 An example of a switch-over from the broadband to narrowband
8 speech coding is when there's a bottleneck in the allocation of resources.

9 JUDGE TURNER: Can I just stop you.

10 MS. UI: Sure.

11 JUDGE TURNER: The transition of that mode -- how does the last
12 part of Claim 1 that we're talking about, how does that last limitation in
13 Claim 1 doesn't read on that?

14 MS. UI: It was just -- that's just a lead into the fact that, you know,
15 to combine these references, that, that secondary -- the Oestreich reference is
16 not directed to tandem free operation. So, the claim as a whole is directed to
17 a tandem free operation between a mobile, between two mobile phones.

18 So, as this secondary, this secondary reference, Oestreich, is not
19 directed to tandem free operation when it decides to switch-over to the
20 narrowband operation, it's not related to the selection of a common coding
21 mode during tandem operation, during tandem free operation.

22 JUDGE TURNER: Right, but it does disclose the, the, the TFO?

23 MS. UI: In the instance of when it's broadband transmission.

24 JUDGE TURNER: I mean in terms of general disclosure.

25 MS. UI: Yes.

26 JUDGE TURNER: I mean, it does, it does disclose a TFO, so we

1 have in both references do -- do they not or do they -- the both of them --

2 MS. UI: Yes, they disclosure tandem free operation, but it's not
3 during the selection of a common coding mode. So --

4 JUDGE TURNER: Okay, but in terms of the selection, of selecting a
5 common coding mode, the base reference Watanabe does teach that. Does it
6 not, or it does not?

7 MS. UI: The Watanabe reference?

8 JUDGE TURNER: Yes.

9 MS. UI: The primary reference, Watanabe, was not cited for
10 teaching selection of a common coding mode.

11 JUDGE TURNER: I, I understand that explicitly, but the -- my
12 question is does Watanabe actually teach that aspect? I'm just saying the
13 Examiner says is not relying on the Watanabe for that, but my question to
14 you would be doesn't Watanabe teach selection a common coding mode for
15 each mobile station?

16 MS. UI: How --

17 JUDGE TURNER: Which is sort of the first part of the, of, of the --

18 MS. UI: Yes, however it's clear in Watanabe that that selection of a
19 coding mode is purely based on a priority table that is preset and is not
20 modifiable. It's either A or B, and A being priority over B. And so, it does
21 not take into account any of the other situation other than this preset A or B.

22 JUDGE TURNER: Okay. No, I understand that it's different. I
23 mean, I guess the question is does it teach that aspect of selecting a common
24 mode for each mobile station. I understand that there are other --

25 MS. UI: Sure.

26 JUDGE TURNER: --bases on which it's doing it, but it would seem

1 like it does at least satisfy that part. I understand it doesn't satisfy the rest in
2 your estimation.

3 MS. UI: Yes, it does not satisfy.

4 JUDGE TURNER: Okay.

5 MS. UI: Okay. So continuing back with Oestreich reference --

6 JUDGE TURNER: Okay.

7 MS. UI: -- so, basically it's our position that since -- it's basically
8 just a switching between a broadband to a narrowband transmission and it's
9 not directed to selecting a common coding mode for each mobile station.

10 And, then with respect to the Watanabe reference, the Examiner had
11 referred to the Watanabe reference as the primary reference for teaching.
12 So, it's Applicant's position that Watanabe discloses a selection of a coding
13 mode according to a coding mode which mobile stations have in common,
14 and in particular the goal of Watanabe is to permit a control station to select
15 a speech coding scheme according to an order of priority. So, in
16 determining which coding mode selected preferences given purely based on
17 priority. And, in Watanabe preference is given, is given to coding mode A
18 which has higher priority over coding mode B as I discussed earlier.

19 And, the feature of Watanabe is that the transfer of selection
20 conditions between control stations is not required since priority information
21 regarding the coding schemes are already pre-stored. And, the selection of
22 Watanabe merely selects the highest priority coding mode which can be used
23 by mobile stations, for example, in communication with each other, and is
24 based purely on, on stored table information. So, therefore, it is the
25 Appellant's position that the combination of Watanabe with Oestreich is not
26 obvious because Watanabe clearly states a table structure with this limited

1 information within the table. So, it is Appellant's position that is contrary to
2 the principal of operation of Watanabe which clearly has the stable structure
3 to take into account any other factors in the determination of an allegedly
4 optimum transmission load -- I mean coding mode.

5 So, basically it's Appellant's position that a selection of a coding
6 mode in Watanabe is based solely on the coding mode that the mobile
7 stations have in this table, and there's no teaching or suggestion that the
8 selection of the coding mode takes into account traffic load of a sub. And,
9 there was no teaching or suggestion that it should be modified otherwise as it
10 clearly indicates it's a table.

11 So, therefore these reasons it's the Appellant's position that Claim 1's
12 independent claims should be deemed allowable. And, Claim 22 recites
13 elements similar to Claim 21 and so -- to 1, so it should be deemed
14 allowable for similar reasons. Thank you.

15 JUDGE TURNER: But, but just one last quick question.

16 MS. UI: Sure.

17 JUDGE TURNER: You, you had indicated that, that you -- that the
18 references were not combinable in your view and Appellant's view because
19 there were inner operable with --

20 MS. UI: No, not because they were inner operable, but because the
21 primary reference clearly indicates a way of obtaining an allegedly optimum
22 signal and it does that purely by this table structure. So -- and it, and it does
23 not take into account any other factors, and it appears as if it suffers from the
24 same deficiencies of the prior art discussed in the background of the
25 applicants invention in which selecting a common coding mode it merely
26 selects the, the, the optimized priority mode and that's all it does. And so, it

1 seems to suffer from the same deficiencies in the prior art is that it never
2 takes into account other factors that can slow down the transmission of
3 signal information. So, that is why it's not Appellant's position that it's not
4 obvious because, you know, in, in the prior art it never took that into
5 account.

6 JUDGE TURNER: It seems a little bit like you're sort of suggesting
7 teaching away, but you're not saying it. And, I, I would just want to be
8 clear.

9 MS. UI: I don't believe the reference teaches away from obtaining an
10 optimum signal, but, I mean, I believe that it does not teach taking into
11 account any other information other than a priority table.

12 JUDGE TURNER: Okay, any questions? Okay.

13 MS. UI: Thank you.

14 JUDGE TURNER: Thank you.

15 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)